

controls. Recognizing that the concepts of risk assessment versus inspection and abatement versus interim controls are crucial distinctions for future hazard reduction efforts, EPA has added language clarifying these terms. However, EPA has also removed much of the more technical discussion of the specific steps involved in each activity. This revised language more effectively accomplishes the pamphlet's goal of providing homeowners and occupants with an understanding of the key concepts and activities in reducing their risk of lead hazard exposure.

4. *Testing/screening children for lead.* EPA received considerable comment on appropriate recommendation language for childhood testing and screening. EPA has worked closely with CDC to analyze these comments and to develop revised testing and screening language that is fully consistent with CDC guidelines and also understandable for lay readers.

5. *Developing workable effective day-to-day cleaning measures.* A number of commenters suggested modifications to simple steps recommended for reducing lead hazards in housing. In particular, commenters identified potential issues related to recommending trisodium phosphate (TSP) or other high phosphate cleaning products for regular cleaning on all surfaces. In consultation with other Federal agencies, EPA has revised the recommendations to place the focus more on day-to-day types of home maintenance activities that can be effective at reducing, but not eliminating, lead hazard when conducted regularly.

6. *Comments not addressed.* EPA received many specific language changes and detailed policy recommendations that were not incorporated into the final pamphlet. During the pamphlet's revision, EPA, CPSC, and other participating agencies analyzed each recommendation in terms of the policy, technical, and editorial merit (and in light of the pamphlet's goals, target audience, and scope). As the whole document evolved, changes to the draft pamphlet frequently rendered some specific comments moot. The fact that a comment is not directly reflected in the final pamphlet does not necessarily indicate that the comment lacked merit. Rather, many comments were excluded since the comments no longer fit within the pamphlet's level of detail or scope.

IV. Alternative Languages

EPA recognizes that this lead hazard information may be important in some communities that have a limited ability to utilize information provided in

English. For that reason, EPA is currently developing a Spanish language version of the pamphlet. EPA and CPSC will announce the availability of the Spanish-language pamphlet in the **Federal Register** when available and immediately begin efforts to distribute the document through available channels.

In addition, the Agency is exploring avenues such as public-private partnerships for conducting translations into additional languages, such as Chinese and Korean. Organizations interested in working with EPA and CPSC to print and distribute the pamphlet, or to develop new pamphlet translations should write to: Paula Moser, Program Development Branch, Environmental Protection Agency (7404), 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460.

Based on the response from interested organizations, EPA and CPSC will develop a plan for preparing additional translations.

List of Subjects

Environmental protection, Lead.

Dated: July 25, 1995.

Lynn R. Goldman

Assistant Administrator for Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances.

[FR Doc. 95-18875 Filed 7-31-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-F

[OPPTS-211042A; FRL-4968-9]

TSCA Section 21 Petition; Response to Citizens' Petition

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

ACTION: Notice; Response to citizens' petition.

SUMMARY: On April 19, 1995, EPA received a petition under section 21 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), 15 U.S.C. 2620, signed by 24 environmental groups located in 10 western and mid-western States. The petition asserts that cement-producing plants that burn hazardous waste-derived fuel (WDF) in their kilns have higher concentrations of toxic metals in their cement end-products, and that these products therefore pose risks to end-users. The petition requests that EPA promulgate a rule under section 6 of TSCA requiring those producers who burn WDF to label their cement with a notice advising consumers of that fact, and cautioning them to avoid emitting or breathing the cement dust and to avoid direct contact.

The petition is denied on two grounds: (a) petitioners have not

substantiated the assertion that burning WDF increases risks posed to end-users of cement; and (b) for risk protection purposes, the label requested essentially duplicates labeling already required by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Susan B. Hazen, Director, Environmental Assistance Division (7408), Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics, Environmental Protection Agency, Rm. E-543, 401 M St. SW., Washington, DC 20460, (202-260-1024), Internet: TSCA-Hotline@epamail.epa.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Statutory Requirements

Section 21 of TSCA provides that any person may petition EPA to initiate proceedings for issuance of rules under sections 4, 6, and 8 of TSCA, or to issue orders under sections 5(e) or 6(b)(2) of TSCA. A section 21 petition must set forth facts which petitioners believe establish the need for the rules requested. EPA is required to grant or deny the petition within 90 days. If EPA grants the petition, the Agency must promptly commence an appropriate proceeding. If EPA denies the petition, the Agency must publish its reasons in the **Federal Register**.

Within 60 days of denial, or if EPA fails to respond in 90 days, the petitioner may commence a civil action in a U.S. district court to compel initiation of the requested rulemaking. For a petition for a new rule, the court must provide opportunity for the petition to be considered *de novo*. After hearing the evidence, the court can order EPA to initiate the requested action.

II. Approach to Reviewing Petition

Immediately following receipt of the petition, on April 19th, a Workgroup was established with representatives from EPA's Offices of Pollution Prevention and Toxics; Solid Waste and Emergency Response; and General Counsel. After receiving an unsolicited comment on the petition, on May 15th, the Agency decided to publish a Notice of Receipt (60 FR 30538, June 9, 1995), in order to afford all interested parties an opportunity to comment. In keeping with the 90 day deadline for reaching closure, the Workgroup briefed the Director of the Office of Pollution Prevention and Toxics on May 17th, and the Office Director subsequently presented the case to the Assistant Administrator for Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances for a decision.

In response to the FR Notice of Receipt, comments were received from 8 individuals and 10 organizations. Several samples of current cement packaging and Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDSs) were also received. All comments were reviewed and considered by the Agency before reaching its final determination to deny the petition.

III. Background

On April 19, 1995, EPA received a petition under section 21 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), 15 U.S.C. 2620, signed by 24 environmental groups located in 10 western and mid-western States. The petition asserts that cement-producing plants that burn hazardous waste-derived fuel (WDF) in their kilns have higher concentrations of toxic metals in their cement end-products, and that these products therefore pose risks to end-users. The petition requests that EPA promulgate a rule under section 6 of the TSCA requiring those producers who burn WDF to label their products, in both English and Spanish, with the following label.

WARNING: THIS PRODUCT WAS MADE WHILE BURNING HAZARDOUS WASTE AND CONTAINS RESIDUALS OF THAT HAZARDOUS WASTE, INCLUDING INCREASED AMOUNTS OF TOXIC AND CARCINOGENIC METALS. AVOID EMITTING AND BREATHING DUST FROM THIS PRODUCT AND AVOID DIRECT CONTACT WITH THIS PRODUCT.

Cement is made by heating limestone, clay and other substances to very high temperatures in rotary kilns to form a granular material called "clinker", which is then cooled and ground up with gypsum to make cement powder. Cement kiln dust (CKD) waste is generated during the production of clinker. Releases to air, water and land from cement kilns are regulated under the Clean Air Act (CAA), Clean Water Act (CWA), and Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). In 1992, 23 of the 111 domestic cement-producing plants burned WDF to supplement traditional fossil fuels (FF) (Ref. 3, p.7367). Air emissions and disposal of residues from kilns burning WDF are regulated under the Boiler and Industrial Furnace (BIF) regulations issued under RCRA.

While not central to the petition, CKD is tangentially related to petitioners' concerns. CKD is particulate matter, including toxic metals, that has been removed from kiln stack gases by air pollution control equipment. Once removed, CKD may be: (a) reintroduced into the kiln as feedstock; (b) used for such beneficial purposes as general

construction, waste stabilization, or as a substitute for lime and fertilizer in agriculture; or (c) simply disposed. Pursuant to RCRA section 8002(o), EPA published a *Report to Congress on Cement Kiln Dust* in 1993 in which the Agency concluded that although risks associated with CKD management are generally low, CKD could, under some circumstances, pose a danger to human health and the environment (Ref. 2). No decision was made at that time regarding the need to treat CKD as hazardous waste under RCRA Subtitle C.

In February of this year, pursuant to RCRA section 3001(b)(3)(C), the Agency published a *Regulatory Determination on Cement Kiln Dust* (60 FR 7366, February 7, 1995) in which it concluded that additional control of CKD is warranted, and that it would use RCRA Subtitle C and other authorities to control risks where appropriate (Ref. 3). Pending development of those regulations, CKD retains its exemption from regulation under Subtitle C pursuant to the Bevill Amendment contained in section 3001(b)(3)(A). The Regulatory Determination also stated that the Agency would propose exclusion of clinker as "derived-from" hazardous waste when CKD is reintroduced into the kiln as feedstock. Although the Bevill Amendment conditionally exempted CKD from regulation as hazardous waste under Subtitle C, the BIF regulations require kilns burning WDF to test their CKD to ensure that it is not significantly affected by the practice (40 CFR 260.112).

The activities described above address CKD waste disposal issues (the focus of both the Report to Congress and the Regulatory Determination). The petition, on the other hand, is primarily concerned about potential hazards to users posed by toxic metals introduced into cement via combustion of WDF. There are, however, four sources of toxic metals in cement: (1) the original feedstock; (2) CKD recycled as feedstock; (3) the fuel, both FF and WDF, used to heat the kiln; and (4) equipment and processes used, particularly refractory kiln bricks and the steel balls used to grind clinker (Ref. 1, p.50). The relative contribution of each of the four potential sources varies by an unknown extent from facility to facility and from time to time. The concentrations of metals in cement from any given plant are a function of complex interactions among all of these variables. A plant burning FF, using feedstock with a high metal content, and recycling CKD extensively, for example, might produce cement with high

concentrations of metals, while one burning WDF using the same feedstock, but discarding most of its CKD, might produce cement with lower concentrations.

IV. Adverse Effects Associated with Cement

Based on information provided by petitioners, adverse effects associated with cement cited in the petition include: (a) cement eczema or cement dermatitis; (b) lung cancer; (c) asthma; and (d) a variety of other effects including nosebleeds, ulcers, respiratory distress and pneumoconiosis. Of these, cement dermatitis is the most common effect associated with cement, because the relationship between exposure to cement and dermatitis is well-established, and because the effect can occur at relatively low levels of exposure. Frank cement dermatitis is generally preceded by a number of years of skin irritation, abrasions, and cracks. Once established, cement dermatitis is chronic, even if there is no further exposure to cement. The dermatitis sensitization threshold is reported to be in the range of 10 to 15 parts per million (ppm) hexavalent chromium in cement.

V. Analysis of Petition

As general background, petitioners argue that CAA, CWA and RCRA regulations are tightening restrictions on kiln-generated discharges of toxic metals to air, water and land, without restricting transfer of these metals into the cement itself. They contend that this incentive structure has increased the toxic metals content of cement. However, petitioners offer no evidence that concentrations of metals in cement have in fact increased. With respect to the objective of the petition, EPA notes that if restricting toxic metals from all compartments except the end-product is a problem, it would be a problem for all kilns, not simply those burning WDF. The essence of the petition is the more specific assertion that burning WDF increases the amount of toxic metals in cement.

The petition's assertion is based entirely upon evidence petitioners adduce from a 1992 study, published by the Portland Cement Association (PCA), that presented data on heavy metal concentrations found in both CKD and cement produced in facilities using FF only, and in facilities using WDF (Ref. 1). The study determined both "total" (acid soluble) and "leachable" (water soluble) concentrations of 12 metals (arsenic, antimony, barium, beryllium, cadmium, chromium, lead, mercury, nickel, selenium, silver and thallium) in both CKD and cement drawn from 97

North American kilns. The results were tabulated, among other ways, according to whether the originating kilns burned FF or WDF. Relevant findings of the study were that (a) the mean "total metal" concentration of only one metal, chromium, was statistically significantly higher in cement from kilns burning WDF than from kilns burning FF; (b) for the remaining 11, some of the "total metal" concentrations were higher and some lower, but none by statistically significant amounts; and (c) none of the "leachable metal" concentrations differed significantly in cement for any of the 12 metals. Evidence brought forth by petitioners therefore suggests only that burning WDF may increase concentrations of chromium in cement; no empirical case is made for metals in general.

Petitioners, however, have not established that burning WDF increases even chromium concentrations in cement. There are two flaws in the reasoning and evidence presented. The first has to do with the inability of the cited PCA study to identify the source of metal concentrations found in the cement samples. Although the study documented statistically significant

higher mean levels of total chromium (113 vs. 61.7 ppm) in cement from the kilns burning WDF, the authors of that study explicitly cautioned against attributing the difference to type of fuel burned:

Identification of the specific sources of the twelve chemical elements in the samples is beyond the scope of this study. Sources include fuel, raw materials, refractories, and processing equipment that comes into contact with the materials. For any particular kiln system, the concentration of these elements in cement and kiln dust is a function of the manufacturing process and the total metals input from all sources.

Because of widespread interest in the burning of alternate fuels in cement kilns, comparisons are presented in this data summary between kiln systems using waste fuels and coal, coke or natural gas. However, the reader should not infer that observed differences are necessarily attributable to the waste fuels, as that is only one of many sources of metals in this multivariate system. (Ref. 1; p.1 of Data Summary appended to reference)

Construction Technology Laboratories (CTL), the firm PCA used to conduct the study, reiterated this concern in an April 24, 1995 letter addressed to the Executive Director of the Cement Kiln

Recycling Coalition (CKRC), a trade association of cement producers that burn WDF. That letter, forwarded by CKRC to EPA on May 15, 1995, states in part, that "It was not the purpose of the study to determine the specific sources of trace elements in cements. The work on which this report is based did not include a complete material balance for each plant that submitted samples. Therefore, increases or decreases in trace metals concentrations cannot necessarily be attributed to fuel type."

The second point has to do with the substance selected by petitioners for discussion. They highlighted the statistically significant higher concentration of "total chromium" found by the PCA study in cement from kilns that burned WDF. The following table (derived from Ref. 1) also shows the concentrations of "leachable chromium" found in the same study. The mean difference in leachable chromium between kilns burning WDF and FF is not statistically significant. The evidence from the study cited by petitioners for increased chromium in kilns burning WDF is therefore mixed.

TOTAL AND LEACHABLE CHROMIUM LEVELS FOUND IN CEMENT PRODUCED BURNING WDF AND FF (PPM)

Levels	Total Chromium		Leachable Chromium	
	WDF Cement	FF Cement	WDF Cement	FF Cement
Minimum	33.3	24.6	3	<1.2
Mean	113	61.7	12	10
Maximum	422	214	24	31

This table also sheds light on any practical impact WDF might add to risks posed by chromium in cement. The mean concentrations of leachable chromium in cement produced with either WDF or FF are in the 10 to 15 ppm range — levels at which cement dermatitis could be expected if precautionary steps were not taken to avoid dermal contact. The maximum levels of leachable chromium detected in both types of cement are well above the upper end of that range. For total chromium, all values are well above the threshold levels. The risks are therefore potentially present in cement regardless of the type of fuel used. If these risks are considered sufficiently serious to warrant labeling, therefore, the precautionary warning sought by petitioners should arguably be affixed to all cement packaging, not simply to cement produced in kilns burning WDF.

The only study petitioners cite as demonstrating that burning WDF

increases levels of chromium (or any other metal) in cement more than burning FF, therefore, cannot confirm that assertion. It further suggests that even if the assertion were demonstrated, the magnitude of the increase in the amount of chromium, relative to the amount typically found in all cement, would not materially alter the pre-existing level of potential risk. In summary, the only evidence petitioners cite as evidence that burning WDF adds toxic metals to cement is a study which:

- Found that concentrations of "total chromium", not metals in general, were statistically significantly higher in cement produced in kilns burning WDF—but did not, and was not intended to, attribute that difference to WDF;

- Found no statistically significant difference in the concentration of leachable chromium in cement produced with and without burning WDF; and

- Found that burning both FF and WDF generates concentrations of chromium in cement at and above reported threshold levels for cement dermatitis.

EPA's analysis of (a) the material presented by petitioners, and (b) the PCA study¹, has concluded that petitioners have not provided convincing evidence for their basic contention, or for the need for regulation under TSCA.

VI. Other Evidence

Other data are available that bear on the question of whether use of WDF adds metals to cement. EPA's *Regulatory Determination on Cement Kiln Dust*, although not concerned with cement, did compare metal

¹ The petition did not include the PCA study. The findings reported in the petition regarding the PCA study were drawn from data about that study cited in a secondary article supplied by petitioners. The caveats on use of the study's findings, contained in the original, did not appear in the secondary work.

concentrations found in CKD produced in plants burning FF and WDF. That determination noted that:

For many of the toxic metals, the concentrations detected in kiln dust were not significantly different whether the dust is generated from kilns that burn or do not burn hazardous waste. However, for lead, cadmium, and chromium, the mean concentrations found in CKD generated by kilns that burn hazardous waste is measurably higher than in CKD from those kilns that do not burn hazardous waste; conversely, thallium and barium concentrations are measurably higher in CKD from kilns that do not burn hazardous waste (Ref. 3, p.7369).

Again, the evidence is inconsistent; concentrations of some metals in WDF-generated CKD are higher, but others are lower. The continuing difficulty, however, is in establishing causality. As previously noted, the concentration of metals found in any given plant's cement results from complex interactions among several site-specific variables; in the absence of a study controlling for these variables, one cannot confidently attribute variations in metal concentrations among plants to any one source. There is one industry study, *A Comparison of Metal and Organic Concentrations in Cement and Clinker Made With Fossil Fuels to Cement and Clinker Made with Waste Derived Fuels* (Ref. 4), that determined the concentrations of metals in cement produced at a single facility that initially used WDF, and then switched temporarily to FF. Other operating conditions were held constant in both time periods, and 20 cement samples were taken in each. That study found detectable amounts of four metals. In one phase (pH=5 extract waters), the mean concentration of antimony was statistically significantly higher in the cement generated burning WDF, but there were no significant differences for either cadmium or chromium. In the second phase (pH=10 extract waters), the mean concentration of chromium in cement produced while burning WDF was statistically significantly lower than in cement produced burning FF—exactly opposite to the PCA findings. The differences for nickel were insignificant.

The totality of evidence, then, does not confirm that burning WDF in kilns materially increases concentrations of metals in cement. It also shows that decreased concentrations of metals can occur, and the net human health potential, if any, is simply unknown. In any event, based on the available information, the type of fuel burned in kilns appears to be a minor determinant of the concentration of metals in cement

relative to (a) the extent to which CKD is recycled as feedstock, and (b) the metals content of the original feedstock. Finally, the evidence indicates that all domestic² cement poses a potential problem to long-term users who fail to take precautionary steps to avoid exposures. Any labeling intended to warn users of this hazard should therefore be applied to all cement, not simply to cement produced with WDF.

VII. OSHA's Labeling Requirement

The current regulatory situation recognizes the need for comprehensive labeling of cement. Although petitioners state that the problems they discuss cannot be adequately addressed under other statutes, OSHA's Hazard Communication Standard (29 CFR 1910.1200) does, in fact, require cement manufacturers to label virtually all containers of their products with essentially all of the information petitioners want to convey, other than the fact that the cement was produced through burning of WDF. This requirement extends to all cement, not just that produced with WDF. Pertinent provisions of the Hazard Communication Standard require chemical manufacturers (cement producers, for this purpose, are considered chemical manufacturers) of products for which there is evidence of health hazard to label all containers of the product providing: (a) the identity of the chemical; (b) appropriate hazard warnings; and (c) the name and address of the manufacturer (29 CFR 1910.1200(f)). Manufacturers must also ensure that distributors and employers using the product are furnished with appropriate MSDS, and downstream wholesalers and retailers are required to ensure that these warnings are carried with the product through the distribution chain to the ultimate end-user. A typical cement bag label reads as follows:

CAUTION EYE AND SKIN IRRITANT

Contains Portland Cement (CAS No. 65997-15-1). Do not allow contact with eyes or skin. Contains concrete aggregates Sand/Gravel (CAS No. 14808-60-7). Avoid breathing dust—respirable Silica may cause serious lung problems.

Use gloves, goggles, dust masks, and waterproof protective clothing. If material gets into eyes, rinse immediately with clean water and seek prompt medical attention. If material gets onto skin or saturates clothing, rinse immediately and thoroughly with clean water. CONTACT WITH WET PORTLAND

²There is some evidence that the hexavalent chromium content of cement can be reduced by adding ferrous sulfate. Petitioners cite references indicating that Denmark has made it illegal to sell cement with more than 2 ppm CR (VI).

CEMENT MAY CAUSE SERIOUS SKIN BURNS."

EPA believes that the hazard communication label required by OSHA provides sufficient warning to users of cement to allow them to take appropriate steps to protect themselves from exposure to cement products.

VIII. Comments Received

EPA published a Notice of Receipt of the Petition in the **Federal Register** (60 FR 30538; June 9, 1995), in order to provide opportunity to comment to all interested parties. Comments were received from 8 individuals, all of whom supported the petition, and 10 organizations. Several samples of current cement packaging and MSDSs were also received. All comments were reviewed and considered by the Agency before reaching its final determination to deny the petition.

Six of the 10 organizations wrote in support of the petition. Of these, 3 were among the 24 signers of the petition itself; 1 is another environmental group; 1 is a general contractor; and 1, Rollins Environmental Services, operates hazardous waste incinerators. The Rollins submission included two studies bearing on the question of the contribution of WDF to metals in cement. The first study was a mass balance analysis conducted at Rutgers University with the support of the Association for Responsible Thermal Treatment (ARTT), an organization of some hazardous waste incinerator companies. That study models the operation of cement kilns, and concludes, among other things, that burning WDF could increase the metals content of cement. The second study is a risk assessment undertaken by ENVIRON Corporation, using the data generated by the Rutgers model, and a portion of the PCA data. These studies were reviewed by EPA, insofar as time permitted, but did not alter the Agency's decision on the petition because: (a) there is no apparent justification for substituting modeling data for the extensive empirical monitoring data available; (b) the model itself appears flawed in that a light weight aggregate kiln, rather than a cement kiln, was used in its development; (c) the model has only recently been developed, and has not yet been peer reviewed; and (d) the ENVIRON study is largely based upon the unpersuasive modeling results (Refs. 5 and 6).

The four organizations that wrote in opposition to the petition included the CKRC; the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers Helpers; LaFarge Corporation, a cement producer that

burns WDF; and Union Carbide Corporation, a company that uses cement kilns to handle wastes produced manufacturing petrochemicals. These commenters generally noted advantages that accrue from recovering energy from waste by burning it as fuel in kilns, asserted that petitioners had not provided sufficient evidence of increased risk, and cited the current regulatory requirement for labeling.

IX. Disposition of Petition

Based upon (a) the lack of convincing evidence that WDF contributes materially to the hazards posed by cement; and (b) the fact that current OSHA regulations already require virtually everything petitioners request, other than a reference to WDF, the petition is denied.

X. References

The following references were used in reviewing this petition:

1. Portland Cement Association. An Analysis of Selected Trace Metals in Cement and Kiln Dust, 1992.
2. USEPA. Report to Congress on Cement Kiln Dust. Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response. USEPA 530-S-94-001, December 1993.
3. USEPA. Regulatory Determination on Cement Kiln Dust: Final Rule. Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response. USEPA 60 FR 7366, February 7, 1995.
4. NSF. A Comparison of Metal and Organic Concentrations in Cement and Clinker made with Fossil Fuels to Cement and Clinkers Made with Waste Derived Fuels: Final Report. *NSF International*. November 13, 1995.
5. Review of Comments submitted by Rollins Environmental Services; memorandum from Oscar Hernandez to Edward Brooks, July 13, 1995.
6. Review of Rutgers' Model as Discussed in Submission by Rollins Environmental Services: June 26, 1995; memorandum from William A. Schoenborn to Edward Brooks, July 18, 1995.

XI. Public Record

EPA has established a public record of those documents the Agency considered in reviewing this petition. The record consists of documents in the file designated by Docket Number OPPT-211042, located in the TSCA Public Docket Office. This Docket is available for inspection from 12 noon to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, except legal holidays, in the TSCA Nonconfidential Information Center, Rm. NEB-607, 401 M St., SW., Washington, DC 20460. The public record consists of all documents

in the OPPT file and all documents cited in the documents in that file.

List of Subjects

Environmental Protection, hazardous waste.

Dated: July 24, 1995.

Susan H. Wayland,

Assistant Administrator for Prevention, Pesticides and Toxic Substances.

[FR Doc. 95-18871 Filed 7-31-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-F

[FRL-5268-3]

Science Advisory Board Drinking Water Committee Open Meeting August 16-18, 1995

Under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92-463, notice is hereby given that the Science Advisory Board's (SAB) Drinking Water Committee (DWC) will meet Wednesday through Friday, August 16-18, 1995 at the Courtyards of Marriott, 2899 Jeff Davis Highway, Arlington, VA 22202, telephone (703) 549-3434. The meeting will take place from 9 am to 4:30 pm on August 16th, 8:30 am to 5 pm on August 17th and from 8:30 until approximately noon on August 18th. The meeting is open to the public and seating is on a first-come basis.

At this meeting, the Committee plans to: (1) Discuss potential activities for fiscal year 1996; (2) conduct a review of the Agency's drinking water distribution systems research; (3) conduct a review of the health significance of HPC bacteria; (4) receive briefings from the Agency's Offices of Water (OW) and Research and Development (ORD) on issues such as: (a) disinfection byproducts research plan, (b) regulatory reassessment, (c) ground water disinfection rule, (d) cooperative projects in risk assessment between EPA and ILSI, (e) microbial contaminants risk assessment, and (f) drinking water contaminant selection process. Some of these briefings are subject to change and other briefings may also be presented. As of the preparation date of this notice, the Committee has not been provided with any review materials. For further information on available materials and on the specific topics listed above, please contact Mr. Flaak, Designated Federal Official, at the numbers given below.

For copies of the agenda and other practical meeting information, please contact Ms. Mary Winston, Staff Secretary, telephone: (202) 260-6552; FAX: (202) 260-7118. For more detailed or technical information related to the meeting, please contact Mr. Robert

Flaak, Designated Federal Official, Science Advisory Board (1400F), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street, SW., Washington, DC 20460 at telephone: (202) 260-5133, fax: (202) 260-7118, or via the INTERNET at: FLAAK.ROBERT@EPAMAIL.EPA.GOV).

Members of the public who wish to make a brief oral presentation to the Committee must contact Mr. Flaak no later than August 10, 1995, in order to be included on the Agenda. Written statements of any length (at least 35 copies) may be provided to the Committee up until the meeting. The Science Advisory Board expects that public statements presented at its meetings will not be repetitive of previously submitted oral or written statements. In general, each individual or group making an oral presentation will be limited to a total time of ten minutes or less, at the Chair's discretion.

Dated: July 24, 1995.

A. Robert Flaak,

Acting Staff Director, Science Advisory Board.

[FR Doc. 95-18835 Filed 7-31-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6560-50-P-M

[FRL-5267-1]

Transfer of Confidential Business Information to Contractors

AGENCY: Environmental Protection Agency.

ACTION: Notice of transfer of data and request for comments.

SUMMARY: EPA will transfer Confidential Business Information (CBI) to its contractor SAIC, Inc., and its subcontractors: ICF Inc., DPRA and Kerr Associates Confidential Business Information (CBI) that has been or will be submitted to EPA under Section 3007 the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Under RCRA, EPA is involved in activities to support, expand and implement solid and hazardous waste regulations.

DATES: Transfer of confidential data submitted to EPA will occur no sooner than August 11, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be sent to Regina Magbie, Document Control Officer, Office of Solid Waste (5305), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 401 M Street SW., Washington, DC 20460. Comments should be identified as "Transfer of Confidential Data."

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Regina Magbie, Document Control Officer, Office of Solid Waste (5305), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency,